AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig 2.

REMARKS

The objection to the drawing set forth in item 6, page 2, of the Office Action and the vague and indefinite aspect of Claim 12, as set forth on page 3 of the Office Action have been rectified by appropriate amendment.

The independent claims have been amended for clarity, to assure infringement at the time the goods are sold and to distinguish over the new ground of rejection under 35 USC 103(a) based on Joo et al., WO 01/65396, in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA), relied on in the most recent office action to reject claims 1-4 and 12-19.

The claims as amended relate to a method and device for video projection, wireless video projection in particular, and the aim pursued is to remedy some disadvantages of the prior art by proposing a **simple** video-projection device and method for video-projecting video data displayed on the terminal screen with which it is possible to **remotely control projection without modifying the terminal containing the data to be projected.** Antecedent basis for the foregoing limitation added to the claims is found at § [0009] and [0013] of applicant's published application, 2007/0073843 A1. More particularly, the claims are directed to a device and a method, using the video-projector for projection onto a screen of a conference room, for projecting video data displayed on the screen of terminal by the operating system of the terminal via the video card of the terminal onto the screen of the projection room, **without having to install any remote control software on the terminal as in the prior art, which is a lengthy, cumbersome operation requiring the possession of various different software programs equal in number to the terminals on which the software is to be installed**.

According to the AAPA, wireless video-projection devices, such as those shown in applicant's FIG. 2, comprise a terminal, a server and a projector. Software for remote controlling the projection, permitting control over the starting and stopping of the projection, must firstly be installed on the terminal. Video software, such as a VNC viewer, is installed on the server which is connected by a hardwire connection to the

projector. Execution of the remote control projection software by an operating system of the terminal causes the transfer of video data displayed on the screen of the terminal through a network card of the terminal towards the server via a wireless network. The server receives these data via a network card which transmits the same to the video software. The video software then sends these data to the projector which projects the video data on a screen (see § [0003] of applicant's published application).

Karasawa, US 2003/0117532, discloses a wireless video-projection device including one mobile terminal, such as a personal organizer, and a projector. The terminal and the projector each comprise a network module for wireless communication with each other. Remote control projection software is installed on the terminal, being downloaded for example from the projector. The data to be projected are transmitted to the projector from the terminal or from a data server connected by a hardwire connection to the projector. With this device it is also possible to manage the projection of data emitted by several terminals each of which includes remote control projection software enabling wireless projection of the data emitted by the different terminals either simultaneously or in a certain sequential order (see § [0004] of applicant's published application).

One drawback of these prior art devices is the need to start by installing the remote control projection software on the terminal before the terminal can be used with the projector. Also, if several persons wish to use the projector simultaneously they must all install the software on their terminals before using the projector, which is restrictive and time-consuming (see § [0005] of applicant's published application).

EP 1 244 303 discloses a wireless video projection device which enables a video projector to project audio and video data transmitted by a wireless connection from a terminal, such as a computer, to the video-projector, wherein the audio and video data can be received from different sources. However, **this device requires the terminal to be equipped with different modules compatible with reception of data derived from different sources**. In addition, **these modules must transform the data** so that the data are compatible with the video-projector (see § [0006] of applicant's published

application).

Hsiao, US 2003/0081561, discloses a wireless video-projection device comprising a computer and a video-projector. **This device requires encrypting of the data by the computer and decrypting of the coded data by the projector. The video-projector can therefore only be used with a computer having a specific encrypting module compatible with the decrypting module of the video-projector, which necessitates installing the module on the computer from which the data are to be projected** (see § [0007] of applicant's published application).

Eventually, document US 2002/0098.819 further discloses a wireless video-projection device comprising a computer, a server and a video-projector. The server eliminates the need to modify the computer. In this device, the server is controlled by a console controlled by an operator. **The disadvantage of this device is that it is complex** (see § [0008] of applicant's published application).

Joo relates to a distributed webcasting system and method for generating data using a web camera installed at a computer having a motion picture reproducing application. Joo alléges the system allows anyone to easily produce a private production and to broadcast the production over the Internet in real time using a camera and image capture (see the Joo "Technical Field").

In the "Background Art" part of the reference, Joo states webcasting is still difficult for general Internet users to approach. Users need to (1) have access to a high-speed Internet connection, (2) have a private line and (3) buy expensive equipment. In addition, since existing webcasting depends on some large stations, diversification in providing information is not accomplished so that general Internet users cannot be provided with desired programs at desired places. Since webcasting users are provided only with productions recorded and edited at studios in webcasting stations, the users are provided with only very restricted multimedia information. Moreover, in the case of existing webcasting, only information supplied through a web camera installed at a computer can be broadcasted. In the other words, a broadcast producer who accesses the Internet through a computer cannot directly broadcast pictures reproduced through

application programs in the computer, without using a web camera.

A first object of Joo is to provide a distributed webcasting system and method for allowing those who wish to broadcast, to produce a production and broadcast it to general Internet users in real time. A second object of Joo is to provide a distributed webcasting system and method for broadcasting video or audio output through a monitor or a speaker, as well as data derived by a web camera by capturing an image using a video or audio file execution application. A third object of Joo is to provide a distributed webcasting system and method capable of webcasting with a web camera and headset equipment only by converting expensive compressing and editing equipment into software. A fourth object of Joo is to provide a distributed webcasting system and method for allowing viewer clients and producer clients to communicate with each other through a chatting server (see page 3, line 29, to page 4, line 14, of Joo).

Thus, the subject matter of applicant's independent claims and Joo do not relate to the same domain. Moreover, none of the aims pursued by Joo's application is related to a simple video projection device and method which make it possible to remotely control video projection without modifying a terminal containing the data to be projected. Thus, the aims pursued by Joo's application have no common matter with the aim pursued by the method and structure of applicant's independent claims.

Claim 1 distinguishes over Joo and the AAPA by requiring a terminal to load a server with a file including remote control projection software for allowing conversion of video data into a format comprehensible by video software installed on the server, without requiring any specific encrypting module to be installed on the terminal. Antecedent basis for these limitations is found in applicant's published application in Figure 1 and paragraph 0030 which states "*the server connected to the video-projector comprises a HTTP server which hosts a web site corresponding to a determined URL address. This web site comprises at least one web page with which at least one* [...] *file is linked that contains the remote control projection software offering an ActiveX interface enabling the network access software and scripts of the web page to execute*

and control the [...] *file*".

In contrast, page 12, lines 8 to 13, of Joo states "*if the producer client's requests to open a broadcasting channel is received, a broadcasting server determines whether the producer client requests a broadcasting channel for the first time* [then] *if the request is the first one, a client program for broadcasting (e.g. Active X) which is software necessary for producing a webcast according to the present invention is automatically installed*".

On page 11, lines 18 to 21, Joo further discloses that "*after completing basic preparation for webcasting, the producer client inputs the URL address of a site which opens a broadcasting channel to commence webcasting*".

Thus, it would be only an enhancement of the present application to make it possible for the server to automatically install an AcitveX interface on the terminal, if this is not always the case. However, the above cited characteristic disclosed by Joo does not disclose the claim limitation relating to a terminal that loads on a server a file including remote control projection software for converting video data into a format comprehensible by video software installed on the server, without requiring any specific encrypting module to be installed on the terminal.

Joo does not disclose the step of applicant's claim 4 relating to loading a file which includes "*remote control projection software*".

Moreover, Joo does not disclose applicant's limitation of claim 4 relating to sending "*video data displayed on the screen of the terminal*". Instead Joo discloses transmitting *video data*" captured by a web camera, for example. The video data broadcasted by Joo is never considered to be the video data displayed on the screen of the producer client.

In addition, Joo does not disclose the claim 4 requirement for receiving video data by video software adapted to the video projector, wherein the video data, before being sent, is converted by use of remote control projection software included in the loaded file into a format comprehensible by the video software installed on the server,

without any specific encrypting module being installed on the terminal to encrypt video data.

Instead, Joo discloses a transmission step involving "*transmitting the encoded broadcasting data to the broadcasting server*", a searching step involving "*searching all channels to assign an empty channel to the producer client*", a linking step involving linking "*the viewer client to the channel in response to the viewer client's request*", then a transmission step involving "*transmitting the broadcasting data to the viewer client through the channel*" (see page 4, lines 15 to 27, of Joo).

There is no disclosure in Joo about video software installed in a server. On page 14, lines 1 to 5, Joo discloses a broadcasting server including a web server, a connection controller, a database, a unit and a gateway. The unit includes a distribution main server processor and distribution sub-server processors. The Joo server links producer clients with viewer clients and transmits broadcast data from producer clients to viewer clients, via suitable management of channels. Because there is no need for video software to be installed on the Joo server, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have modified the Joo server to include such software.

On the other hand, a request sent by the viewer client to the broadcasting server for participation in the channel is clearly required by Joo. To the contrary, applicant's claimed video-projector, which is compared to the Joo viewer client in the office action, does not send any request to the server, but simply receives and projects the video data sent by the server .

According to the above arguments as per claims 1 and 4, the combination of references set forth in the office action is the result of hindsight because the Examiner picks up characteristics claimed in the present application through several patents (Joo and AAPA), which are not related to the same type of apparatus or method and which do not include a teaching or suggestion to combine the features.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 5 which is dependent on claim 4 and is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joo, in view of AAPA, and

in further view of Hsiao, U.S. Publication No. 2003/0081561.

Hsiao forms part of the AAPA discussed in the "Background of the Invention" part of the present application. Moreover, the present application discloses that the Hsiao device requires encrypting of the data by the computer and decrypting of coded data by the projector. The Hsiao video projector can therefore only be used with a computer having a specific encrypting module compatible with the decrypting module of the video-projector, which necessitates installing such a module on the computer from which the data are to be projected.

Claim 5 recites:

"*Video-projection method as in claim 4, wherein the video data, before being sent to the server, is further compressed by the file then, before being sent to the video-projector, is decompressed by the video software*". Claim 4 further, requires the file and the video software to be installed on the server.

The office action asserts that the combination of Joo and AAPA discloses the video-projection method as in claim 4, wherein the video data, before being sent to the server, is compressed by the file. This assertion is made by referring to the following recitation: the encoding unit (referred to as numeral reference 230 on figure 2), inside the producer client, compresses the captured data to facilitate transmission to the broadcasting server (page 10, lines 3-4, of Joo). The Joo encoding unit is a module inside the producer client without regards for any file or program loaded from the broadcasting server to the producer client. The Joo viewer client comprises a decoding unit which is a module inside the viewer client without regards to any video software. This arrangement of Joo must deal with various encoding protocols according to the kind of data (video, audio, picture ...) (see page 10, lines 3 to 25, of Joo).

Hsiao discloses the same characteristic as Joo; see coding module (330) and user datagram protocol transmission module (340) of the user end computer, and decoding module (440) and user datagram protocol receiving module (430) of the wireless projector box on Figure 1 of Hsiao).

In fact, Joo, Hsiao and AAPA disclose a coder located in the terminal to code the data before sending them towards the server. On the contrary, applicant's independent claims are such that there is loading of a file including remote control projection software which, by itself, converts data before sending them to the server. Moreover, the remote control projection software converts data in a way that is adapted to the video software installed on the server. Then, loading the file from the server not only allows remote control projection, without modifying the terminal containing the data to be projected, but also allows, by execution of the loaded file directly on the terminal, conversion of the video data into a format comprehensible by the video software installed on the server. None of Joo, Hsiao and AAPA discloses or suggests such a characteristic, which is absolutely not obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Thus, the the subject matter of the independent claims provides substantial advantages over AAPA and Joo because it is much simpler, for example, by not requiring a coding unit to be installed on the terminal.

In view of the reasons given above, reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of claims 1 to 8 and 11 to 19 are respectfully requested. If the Examiner thinks that any other issue prevents such allowance, the courtesy of a telephone conference with the undersigned before further action in this case is respectfully requested.

The July 16, 2009, Office action contains a number of statements potentially reflecting characterizations of various claims, supporting descriptions, and/or patent or patent application references, but regardless of whether any such statements are addressed in this response, the Principal (as defined in 37 C.F.R. § 1.32(a)(3)) declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office action. Although the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 to 8 and 11 to 19 has been traversed as set forth above without reference to many of such statements, all rights to dispute statements regarding such rejections later in any subsequent applications or causes of action relating to this application or any other application are expressly reserved (in particular, when the Examiner's rejections of the dependent claims have not been

addressed herein apart from their independent base claim, all rights to dispute statements regarding such rejections later in this or any subsequent applications or causes of action relating to this application or any other application are expressly reserved). Accordingly, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above are not exhaustive, there are reasons for patentability of the pending claims (and/or other claims) that have not been expressed. Nothing in this paper should be construed as conceding any issue with regard to any claim except as specifically and expressly stated in this paper, and the proposed amendment of claims should not be construed as conceding the unpatentability of the claims prior to amendment.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP

Allan M. Lowe
Registration No. 19,641

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: November 16, 2009
AML/cjf